## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 3-9, 18, 20, 23, 26-28, 36 and 41 are under consideration in this application.

Claim 38 remain held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to nonelected subject matter 37 CFR 1.142(b).

## Election/Restrictions

Applicants request rejoinder of claim 38. Claim 38 will not be rejoined at this time because applicants have not put claim 3 in allowable condition by deleting the non-elected compounds.

Applicants are reminded where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is *presented prior to* final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be **allowable**, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. In the instant case, claim 38 fails to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Until

Art Unit: 1625

all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b).

The requirement is still deemed sound and proper and is therefore made final.

This application has been examined to the extent readable on the elected compounds wherein A is 3-pyridinyl,  $X^1$  is  $-C(=Y^1)$ -NH, Y is oxygen or sulfur, E is 2-thienyl and substituents a-1, a-2, b represent non-heterocyclic groups as set forth in claim 3, exclusively. All additional heterocycles and heterocyclic substituents pertain to non-elected subject matter.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102, 103 and 112 are hereby withdrawn in view of applicants' amendments to the claims.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-9, 18, 20, 23, 26-28, 36 and 41 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of copending Application No. 11/658,901. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because for the reasons set forth in the previous Office.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

This rejection is maintained because the instant application is not in allowable condition.

## Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/573,890 Page 5

Art Unit: 1625

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patricia L. Morris/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

plm

January 12, 2010